UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/652,023	08/31/2000	Yasuhiro Wakimoto	P108391-00011	4533

7590 10/21/2002

Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin & Kahn PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue NW
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20036-5339

EXAMINER
CHOI, WOO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2186	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/652,023	WAKIMOTO, YASUHIRO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Woo H. Choi	2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 September 2002* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly added claim 18 is not supported in the original specification. The original specification does not disclose a microprocessor where the access speed of one memory unit is faster than an operating speed of another memory unit. Disclosure containing a comparison of two different types of speeds are not found anywhere in the original specification, including the original claims.

The Office asks the applicant to provide support from the original disclosure for this new claim limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maruyama *et al.* (US Patent Application Publication # US 2001/0003199 A1, hereinafter "Marayuma") in view of Dye (US Patent # 6,173,381).

5. With respect to claims 1, 4, 7, and 12, Maruyama discloses a microprocessor to which a plurality of memory units having physical addresses different from each other are externally connected that comprises:

an address conversion unit (figure 1) which assigns a physical address of a first memory unit (12 and 13) out of the plurality of memory units to a logical address of a load module stored in the first memory unit (figure 3), wherein said load module includes instructions and data (12 stores program which is well known in the art to include instruction and data, 13 stores font which is data); and

a copying unit which copies an instruction code from the load module stored in the first memory unit to a second memory unit of the plurality of memory units (claim 2); and

an address conversion unit which assigns a physical address of the second memory unit (14) to a logical address of the instruction code to the second memory unit (figure 3).

However, Maruyama does not disclose the use of two address conversion units to assign physical addresses of the first and the second memory units to their respective logical addresses. On the other hand, Dye teaches us the use of two address conversion units (Dye, figure 3, 140a

and 140b, see also figure 4 and col. 11, lines 43 – 50, where a dual memory control unit generates two sets of physical addresses) to control multiple memory units (col. 10. lines 55 – 59, 140a controls system memory 110 and 140b controls a frame buffer 141, also see figure 4, where multiple banks of memory are controlled by the dual memory controller).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Maruyama and Dye before him at the time the invention was made, to include the dual address conversion unit teaching of the memory microprocessor with address conversion units and multiple memory units of Dye in the design of the microprocessor with an address conversion unit and multiple memory units of Maruyama, in order to be able to address a large amount of memory (Dye, col. 11, lines 43-50) that may be required for image processing.

6. With respect to claims 2, 5, 8, and 13, the address conversion unit assigns the physical address of the first memory unit to the logical address of the load module and the physical address of the second memory unit to the logical address of the instruction code (Maruyama, figure 3).

7. With respect to claims 3, 6, 9, and 14, the first memory unit includes data for image processing and instruction code for image processing (page 3, paragraph 42, line 9-13)

8. With respect to claims 10, 11, 15, 16, and 17 the speed of the second memory module is faster than the first memory module (page 1, paragraph 9, lines 1-2) and the second memory is constituted of a synchronous DRAM (figure 1).

Response to Amendment

9. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 12, and 13 have been amended and claims 17 – 18 have been added.

10. Applicant is required to cancel claim 18 as it contains new matter not disclosed in the original specification as discussed above.

11. Claims 2, 5, 8, and 13 have been amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph. The corresponding rejections are withdrawn.

12. Claims 4 and 12 have been amended to overcome rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph. The corresponding rejections are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments filed September 13, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that Maruyama fails to disclose, teach or suggest at least the first and second address conversion units which assign physical addresses as recited in claim 1 and that Bye fails to remedy this deficiency because there's no teaching or suggestion in Bye that the IMCs assign a physical address of memory unit as recited in claim 1. However, it is to

be noted that while they do not individually teach the assignment of physical addresses as recited in claim 1, it is the combination of the two teachings that disclose the limitations as cited in claim 1.

14. First, Maruyama's disclosure teaches the new limitation, "wherein said load module includes instructions and data", that has been added as discussed in the rejection. Second, what Maruyama fails to disclose, namely, the use of two address conversion units, is taught by Bye with the disclosure that describes multiple address conversion units as discussed above. The applicant seems to suggest that IMCs disclosed by Bye is not an address conversion unit that assigns a physical address. However, as noted in the rejection above, figure 4, and col. 43 – 50, clearly shows a dual memory control unit that generates physical addresses.

15. As to applicant's argument that the references fail to disclose the different uses of a first and a second memory, they are not cited in the rejected claims as the applicant argues. While the specification may have disclosed that the entire load module including data as well as the instruction codes are stored in the large capacity first memory unit, while only the instruction codes of the load module are stored in the second memory unit, the claims do not state that "only the instruction codes of the load modules are stored in the second memory unit". They merely state that "the instruction codes are copied" to the second memory unit. This limitation does not claim the different uses of a first and a second memory module as the first memory module also stores a copy of the instruction codes. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Woo H. Choi whose telephone number is (703) 305-3845. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on (703) 305-3821. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

whc 1 MMK

whc
October 15, 2002

MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100